

Education as Coexistence

Autor: Naděžda Pelcová

Abstract

Education as Coexistence. – This article deals with the ontological character of the educational relationship as it is formed during the crisis of education and upbringing. It is primarily based on Fink's analysis of education, perceived as the basic relationship of a man to the world, to society, and to himself. It asks how to educate in a time when the legitimacy of educational authority is shaken and seeks the preconditions for the possibility of "good" education in the context of questioning all of the traditional values and existing relationships on which education is based.

Keywords: education, educator, educated, crisis

Klíčová slova: výchova, vychovatel, vychovávaný, krize

What is education today, better still, what are its protagonists? Psychologists speak about a generation of "deprivants",¹ little tyrants. Nowadays, it is hard to find school children without at least one diagnosed issue or another (inability to concentrate, ADHD, autism, dyslexia, dysgraphia, dyscalculia, computer addiction, gambling at an early age), or, on the contrary, a specific extraordinary talent. Parents are often offended when they hear from the teacher that their child is perfectly normal that they manage to handle everything adequately.

The science of education, in a way, reflects the peripeteia of the search for "correct" education. The 1980s and 1990s were marked by a strong interest in the educated (the often-frustrated object of education); however, the first two decades of the 21st century shifted interest to the educator (the often-frustrated subject of education exposed to the risk of burnout, stress, depression). Psychologists speak of "lazy parent syndrome", these days. Those are variations of the ideas of Tom Hodgkinson's book *The Idle Parent*,² whose motto is to "leave children alone", create an area of freedom and independence for them. Today, many admit, including Hodgkinson himself, the counterproductive implications of such upbringing: the result is often a lazy child without strong interests and a helpless parent who simply "smothers problems". Among Czech psychologists, the interpretation of the term "lazy parent" has shifted.

These days, it is a parent who does not seek greater freedom and autonomy for the child as originally understood, but is characterized by the fact that the parent sets some rules but does not require or control their fulfilment (they are afraid of emotional engagement, educational conflicts, remain neutral, which often results in indifference or helplessness,

¹ Cf. KOUKOLÍK, František, DRTILOVÁ, Jana. *Vzpouza deprivantů: o špatných lidech, skupinové hlouposti a uchvácené moci*. Praha: Makropulos, 1996.

² HODGKINSON, Tom. *Líný rodič: lenošením a nečinností k lepšímu rodičovství: zaručený návod, jak být pohodovým rodičem*. Brno: Jota, 2009.

sometimes relationships with children are so correct that it seems like we do not care about them, sometimes treating children as adults or as individuals approaches psychological abuse).

Another significant modern phenomenon is that of singles, who dominate today's middle and young generation; if they do not live alone, they often live only side by side, with separate assets, sharing joint loans at most. People have two children together, but they do not marry because they do not want to get married. This is connected with another significant phenomenon of today's society, narcissism. This extreme form of egoism represents a true illness of our time, manifested by spectacular self-presentation, self-admiration, self-affirmation, arrogance and disregard for the other, inability to accept the opinions or interests of others or the whole. Narcissists see other people only as a means of achieving their own goals. The encapsulation of one's ego is typical and is linguistically exaggerated by ostentatiously repeatedly emphasizing one's own perspective: "I think", "I see it that way", "this is or is not my cup of coffee", but also "I don't understand" (often used instead of arguments as a reason for disinterest or a priori rejection). The most popular entertainment is taking selfies and self-presentation on the Internet.

We have to ask ourselves: Is this a consequence of education or a challenge and task for today's education? Let's work with the hypothesis that it is both.

Mankind has reached the stage of individualization, which we can imagine as a fundamental change of state. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin used a chemical illustration to characterize his present in the first half of the 20th century. He compared the state of mankind to the boiling point of water, where separate particles evaporate from a single liquid (water) and the original liquid (one unit) disintegrates into individuals (molecules, atoms) and disperses and evaporates into space.³ Teilhard de Chardin saw this as a symbol of a deep crisis of mankind, in which everyone demands freedom and no one claims responsibility; everyone asserts his rights, and no one is willing to take on the responsibilities associated with them.

A holistic view and attitude to the world has literally evolved and been replaced by particularity. The state of socialization (in which human communities were formed from the beginning) has been replaced in the modern age by a state of individualization, in which the human race found itself and which eventually brought its highly developed civilization to ruin through two world wars. Are we not today more than ever in a similar state of individualization?

These are the questions that led us to formulate the topic of the conference. We were inspired by the title of Fink's work *Existence and Coexistence*⁴ as the basic forms of humanity. Let Fink continue to be the inspiration for our reflections, precisely because, unlike the science of education, he thinks of the education as a relationship. He does not separate the

³ TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, Pierre. *Místo člověka v přírodě: Výbor studií*. Praha: Svoboda, 1967, pp. 72–73. Milan Machovec, for example, writes about the significance of this author in the afterword of the foregoing work: "In the 18th century, only Teilhard had been able to pose the question of 'humanity as a phenomenon' crisscrossing *not only all anthropological disciplines* but all major scientific disciplines as well." *Ibid.*, p. 172.

⁴ FINK, Eugen. *Existenz und Coexistenz. Grundprobleme der menschlichen Gemeinschaft*. Würzburg: Könighausen & Neumann, 1987.

subject from the object as an independent quantity to consider. His reasoning moves towards the ontology of education.

He has the courage to ask himself again: What is education? Despite the fact that we all already know about it, it is one of the basic experiences of our lives. In the footsteps of Fink's education in our reflections, it acts not as an objectifiable object of scientific inquiry, but as a phenomenon, or rather a pre-phenomenon of human being, as existential – as the basis and condition of our human being. The starting point from which we think about the education is first of all the care and concern for the existence of those who depend on us, the care and concern for ourselves to be able to fulfil our tasks, and finally, the care and concern for our common world, a space where we can meet. Man is a being of the world, and the education in this philosophical sense is nothing more than an introduction into the common world, in this sense it has a cosmological character.⁵

Humans use their education to understand the world in which they live, to understand that this world is not something self-evident and given, but something alive that needs to be looked after so that it would not become destroyed. The education teaches mankind to be dependent on the world and teaches him an open relationship to the world. Mankind's humanity is essentially determined by the primordial phenomenon of education: "The education is the establishment of a sojourn in the whole."⁶

Our task is to clarify the form, possibilities and limits of education. The essence of the whole consideration is that what was possible before – to transmit the meaning of human existence from one generation to the next – is no longer possible in the present, because earlier measures used to achieve moral certainty can no longer be used. The question arises as to whether the education is at all competent of conveying meaning when everything is constantly changing, and each generation brings its own life project? We will philosophically reflect on Fink's dilemma expressed in his work *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*⁷ – the Science of Education and Learning by Life. What is the significance of science for the theory of education and for education itself? What is the relationship between the institutional educational policy and the educator's human responsibility? How can we ensure the continuity in education and the possibility of a new, i.e. discontinuity, without which we would find ourselves in a vicious circle of repetition of old mistakes?

For Fink, it is pointless or even misleading to want to build a theory of education – pedagogy as a way of finding how to fulfil certain society-wide or individual human tasks (education as socialization and education as individualization). The education must primarily fulfil its task of bringing people to the whole world, to social relations and to a relation with oneself.

"The education is not primarily an institutional matter (...), it is a completely original relationship of a sojourn with oneself,"⁸ he says. From the beginning, the education has

⁵ DĚDEČKOVÁ, Eva. *Kozmologická filozofia výchovy Eugena Finka*. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Education, 2018.

⁶ FINK, Eugen. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt. Philosophie der Erziehung*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1992, p. 22.

⁷ FINK, Eugen. *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1978.

⁸ FINK, Eugen. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt*, p. 176.

occurred in two streams, ways or strategies; in the obvious, which are institutions that have formed human communities from the outset to ensure continuity. They are initially solid rituals, rules and norms of relationships, hierarchical organization of society, and then schools and educational institutions are created in various forms, leading to educational practices, patterns, guidelines, ideals. In this institutional environment, the science of education (Erziehungswissenschaft) is gradually developed, from reflection. However, in addition to knowledge about education, science, society, culture, and other vital information, the education gives something else, understanding what happiness and misfortune are, what good and evil are, and what is the meaning of life.

It is something like the lower stream of education, unseen, but powerful and active. Fink is convinced that the vital impulses of life do not come from the science of education and reflection, but from the “essential foundation of existence” (Untergrund des Daseins).⁹ This creates tension between the education as a traditionally mediated learning through life (Lebenslehre) and the education as a thematized scientific discipline (Erziehungswissenschaft).

The phenomenon of education needs to be examined in terms of the contradiction and unity of the apparent and the non-apparent; we can use the analogy of the glacier, most of which remains hidden under the surface. Similarly, the phenomenon of education always appears only in a certain context, illumination, and we let it emerge in the context of reflection (in the theory of education) and sometimes in un-reflected closeness as a fundamental experience belonging to human life.

That is why Fink describes the education as an answer to “Lebensnot”, to “life shortage”, where there is no shortage but an enduring state of imperfect, unformed and final being. Only mankind is troubled by the education. It is a fundamental event in which human existence seeks and gains support, form and law. The inherent dependence of man on education can be compared to his dependence on food; even though we are able to cope with a life situation through educational decisions and actions, nothing will protect us from the insecurity and distress that human life and self-care and others bring, just as we will not shed our reliance on food with the sole satisfaction of hunger and thirst. Thus, man is inherently “dependent” on his education throughout his life. The education is the ontological basis of his sojourn here on Earth, it is an expression of man’s desire for bridging a shortage, it underpins his fragile and vulnerable life, it strives to acquire a human form and establish law.

Man is born naked, in every sense a small child is not only weak and helpless, incapable of fending for itself. It is fully dependent on protection, care, nutrition. It does not understand its position, it cannot speak, and it is undeveloped, immature. During its education, its “second birth”, the birth of a social man, takes place in a sense. This little creature, through the education in speech, becomes a cultural creature that understands “meaning” and “sensory content”. The education in speech is at the same time the education in educability and thus has a fundamental importance.¹⁰ A child does not live “weltlos” – without the world, his spirit is no “tabula rasa”; it exists in some hard-to-grasp and hard-to-name way of possibilities; a child is somehow enclosed in the world, his spiritual abilities are not yet developed, but as undeveloped as they are, they are already here!

⁹ FINK, Eugen. *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*, p. 20.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

A child, by its first breath, belongs to the human, historically social world. He hears the first word at birth. A child's speechlessness lies within speech, closeness to society lies within society, closeness to the whole world takes place in this world. We do not begin our lives outside of society, nor outside its institutional forms. Fink adds: "Man never lives in an uncultured state (*kulturlosen Zustand*), he lives in a magical interpretation of the world."¹¹ So the human community is not a thing, an objective given, it is not a neutral object; it is, as Fink says, an "irreversible element of life",¹² so society lives as a dialogue (as mutual listening and speaking). Community works similarly to Plato's light, it is what vision and visibility allow, but it is not visible. Community is what encompasses all members by a single meaning, by sharing a common meaning. It is a bond, about which everyone somehow knows, and everyone seems to understand, but it is unspeakable at the same time. In fact, it can be understood as a field (*Feld*), a medium in which understanding takes place.

In Fink's words, "The education is a common dialogue between old and young, it takes place like the establishment of laws."¹³ The important thing is that the education is a dialogue, a meeting across generations, a bound by solidarity, and a sense of belonging, which obliges them to take care of the newcomers. Therefore, community is this mutual co-existence (*Miteinandersein*). It is neither the anonymous "Mit-sein" of Martin Heidegger, nor *Bei-sein* – being "at" or "beside" itself.

In this sense, the education aims to ensure and protect the continuity of community and culture. "We stand on the ground of tradition, we are the heirs of creative ancestors, we live in the house of the spirit that others have built, [and] we are inhabited in the cultural world we embrace."¹⁴ Hence, the education is always the protective movement of humanity.

At the same time, the education is a hope for the future, it carries with it the entitlement that comes with each new generation, which is to live one's own life and bring something new to life and culture. Therefore, the education always includes discontinuity, the desire for the birth of something original, new, not given. Fink is aware of this internal tension between continuity and discontinuity that is present in the thinking, decision-making, and action of all those involved in education.

This is the most evident in the question of the meaning of life, which forms the existential basis of all education. The meaning of life cannot simply be transmitted. Each generation brings its own life project (*Lebensprojekt*) and, therefore, contains little information about the meaning. The formation of meaning (*Sinnbildung*) can never be considered complete, meaning is always re-revealed (questioned) and shaped.

When we ask, what is the meaning of life? It is important to realize that the question, the courage to ask, not the answer is important. After all, the meaning has been constantly changing and stabilizing. One meaning connects me with my family, another with work or the country where I live. One is the meaning of life in youth, another in adulthood, and another in old age. It is what binds us to life. If something is meaning, it is nothing more than questioning about the meaning.

¹¹ FINK, Eugen *Traktat über die Gewalt des Menschen*. Frankfurt a. Main: Vittorio Kostermann, 1974, p. 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹³ FINK, Eugen. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt*, p. 177.

¹⁴ FINK, Eugen. *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*, p. 7.

It should be added, however, that the learning from life (Lebenlehre) given by parents to their children, by the educator to their students, is not an interpretation, or a reflection of morals, or speaking and acting according to them. The most powerful standards are those that are not explicitly fixed in a table of values, but which are lived.

The loss of meaning in the era of the “European nihilism”

In the 20th century, society underwent substantial changes: the generational experience of the two world wars, abandonment of the notion of human history as a linear progress, the experience of using and abusing the education for power and ideological goals. There was a proclamation of unlimited freedom of a social man and the human subject, which was pragmatically subordinated by man’s own interests and needs. The world, nature, and often other people were understood only as a means of self-realization; economic and material production became the decisive foundation of social life. These changes were also reflected in the transformation of educational institutions in the sense that they accentuated a purely practical focus on education (employment in society, employment on the labour market, qualifications and training, lifelong learning, adaptability to the needs of society), and everything here and now. The reduction and desecration of education were also reflected in its temporal character.

The future is no longer oriented towards a higher common objective (meaning, purpose) in which all special sub-objectives would be fulfilled. Mankind no longer has a clearly outlined “essence” that can be fulfilled or squandered; no role is given, the role which they can assume and whose rejection would mean “guilt”. In this way, human action has become “fragmentary” in a completely new sense, the education no longer has the distinctive character of a manageable problem, “the sensory world has lost the restructured horizon of the future” the matter of education has changed fundamentally.¹⁵ Educators can no longer rely on the customary transmission of the simple ethos of the community; children and young people have no older generation to show them how to cope with life and to set a good example of leadership in life. “We are living in a time of perhaps the greatest uncertainty about the meaning of life... The dream of education has never become as problematic as it is today...,” says the author.¹⁶

According to Fink, we are living at the beginning of an epoch of openly ensuing nihilism, which means nothing more than the abolishment of the universal meaning of human being. In reference to Nietzsche, who speaks of the “death of God” or “the metaphysical sunset”, Fink calls the current crisis “European nihilism”. This nightmarish and unwanted guest (nihilism) does not approach as an unexpected invasion of demonic violence, but rather as the “late fruit of the spiritual history of the West”. When we talk about how nihilism has resulted in the devaluation of all of the highest values, it means, above all, that in pursuing our various goals we have no universal meaning. This means that we do not create any valid structures in our mutual being (Miteinandersein). “That we live in ruins, in the increasingly decaying vaults of the once great architecture of human community.”¹⁷ We have no higher purpose in human life than to explore, work and fight. “We may say that modern man has

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 144–146.

¹⁶ FINK, Eugen. Die Fragwürdigkeit des modernen Erziehers. *Die deutsche Schule* 51/1959, pp. 149–162.

¹⁷ FINK, Eugen. *Traktat...*, pp. 14–16.

achieved scientific knowledge, but not wisdom, he has achieved comfortable well-being, but not happiness.”¹⁸

The catastrophe of contemporary nihilism is significantly deepened by technology, which expresses the specific nature of human action as enforcement; it is a power that enables human dominion over the world and nature. Paradoxically, such a conception of technology controls increasingly more areas of human life and, of course, is also reflected in education:

“Never have educational means been so differentiated, methods of influencing so psychologically perfect, educational technology so appropriate in practice and practicability, educational will so powerful and systematic as they are today. We can decreasingly rely on the effects of simple moral states, on the ennobling, worshiping power of social paradigms, on habit (customs) and paternal morals, attitude and tradition – we can rely on the acting power of family or national spirit less and less. Human education is becoming a planned project. The educational conditioning represents a planned task, regardless of whether it is an individual child, a social group or the whole nation. The education has become a ‘technical problem’, the solution to which can be accomplished like building a bridge across a river, building a house or a city.”¹⁹

The strategy of educational conditioning is elaborated to the smallest detail; in its extreme it can be almost brainwashing, which is nothing other than a “planned, targeted operation exploiting human consciousness”.²⁰ Because states of consciousness, behavioural disposition, manipulation and ultimately controlled fanaticism can be engineered, it appears as if they gave humanity valid life goals. In fact, we have methods of conditioning people more efficiently than ever in the technical age, but we have no goals. Modern man without the prospect of a meaningful and authentic life finds himself in a situation of an essential emergency. The emergency solution in which there is no commonly recognized image of the world; however, the many varied and sometimes contradictory “world views” of the current political limbo require an emergency solution. Nevertheless, despite the helplessness, pain and a feeling of homelessness which are inevitably linked to this nihilism, a new insight surprisingly opens up for Fink.

For Fink, the situation of nihilism is something like a new opportunity, a reassessment of upbringing and education. Understanding that human existence has no pre-ordained meaning can also mean a productive understanding and that meaning cannot be reduced to performance, material production, profit, consumption or entertainment.

Fink poetically describes where we may find support in the situation of crisis as a “common path of the educator and the educated in a starless night”,²¹ where the stars are fixed, grounded and mainly interiorized values on which a stable society rests.

According to Fink, education is something created together, something that only forms through a living relationship. The basic attitude of the educator must be characterized by

¹⁸ FINK, Eugen. *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*, p. 141.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

PHRONÉSIS, prudence.²² In the education, all must be considered prudently, because both seekers must accept the right of the other to their own life view. After all, a true educator is always more than just a means of transport between objective cultural content and a child's soul. The educator is not a means but a mediator.

In times of crisis, the education no longer oscillates around the finished, socially produced sense of life, but it is a mediation of a common search for meaning.²³ In the education, in an environment of nihilism, when everything has become insecure or even futile, advice (Beratung) becomes more important. Thus, nihilism creates a space for the emergence of the so-called "advice community" (Beratungsgemeinschaft), in which reciprocity and pluralism of opinions are cultivated. This advice community is characterized by three fundamental features: firstly, the solidarity of a shared need; secondly, mutual respect for the freedom of the other; and thirdly, consideration of one's own existence.

Thus, the most important educational occurrence (Ereignis) is not a further transmission of the already known and given meaning of life or a thesaurus of values and knowledge, but joint advice (gemeinsame Beratung). Certainly not by chance, there is undoubtedly the influence of Fink's comeniological interests and studies and the inspiration of Comenius's idea of the General Consultation on the Remedy of Human Things. The term "advice" has an ontological or cosmic dimension, returning us to unity with the world. It is not counselling where someone knowledgeable, a professional, gives "good advice" to someone unknowledgeable, such as a tax adviser to a client.

It is about "advising each other" (Sichmiteinanderberaten), it is an encounter in a common cause, it is an encounter in the soil of the world, it is a life encounter in which understanding can only be born together. In education, it is Co-existence,²⁴ a common sojourn of the inhabitants of the earthly world. In it, an adult, in our case a teacher or a parent is no longer an unchallengeable authority, because young people are mainly trained to think for themselves, to investigate, deliberate, and criticize facts. Parents or teachers are no longer the only sources of knowledge, so young people do not automatically listen to them, but think about their claims. They are encouraged by the institution itself to examine, ponder, uphold or refute arguments, as we can see in the case of countless school reforms supporting pupils' independence.

The loss of a clear meaning and path has resulted in education no longer being authoritative. This was possible at a time when the educator had a clear right to a commanding authority, which was lost as a result of modern nihilism. For this reason, education is no longer uncritically accepted through the educator showing an exemplary way of life or presenting the sum of knowledge and the educated accepting it.

It should be added that coexistence is not some other or higher form of existence. Coexistence is not a choice or a possibility that can be cancelled – man is, if he is, always a social being, he is always a relationship, he is never a mere ego or subject. The coexistence structure of the human sojourn is multidimensional: people mutually exist with, beside and against each other. This is not empirically measurable behaviour. The constitution of humanity

²² *Ibid.*, p. 167.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

as such includes “co-humanity”, “reciprocity”. Coexistence is as original as individuality; “society” is just a priori a moment of sojourn as “I”. The other is no later than ego. Man is a fellow man always and at all times. Co-humanity is an ontological determination of sojourn. The question of what man is can never be answered if the basic forms of coexistence are ignored. It ignores the possibilities of how man and fellow man are brought together.

In the question of values, Fink’s value orientation follows Nietzsche’s idea that the highest value is life itself. Therefore, man must adapt to the mobility, variability and dynamics of life situations, which examine each and every value over and over again. In this way, in education all values are reassessed, and always through the lens of life itself. Life situations do not have clear solutions, so we talk about relativism, pluralism, the necessity to tolerate otherness. Under these circumstances, two serious problems may arise for parents or teachers, one on the side of themselves and the other on the side of the educated.

The first problem arises when an adult is unable to offer his or her own legitimate solution and present and defend it in a sufficient and conclusive manner. The second problem arises on the side of the person being educated if he or she is not willing or able to cross the horizon plane of so-called “common sense” and look at things theoretically, i.e., more broadly than it opens up to them through normal experience. The contemporary school, the contemporary process of education, should lead to scientific thinking and action in all disciplines, although it is not clear how the content of knowledge itself should be reduced to a form usable in teaching. Fink writes that today a science teacher has lost the last remnants of the halo, which he or she still usurped in the epoch of believers without doubt in technical and scientific progress, when science was seen as a substitute for religion.

At the same time, it is not possible to limit the task of today’s teacher to provide theoretical knowledge, to conceptualize education as only teaching. After all, the decisive motive of education is the human life, existence and co-existence, the realization of human freedom; man is still interested in the mysteries of love and death; we are enchanted by beauty, we are troubled by poverty and misery²⁵ and all this is a challenge for today’s educator.

Fink states that understanding the true co-existence is the task of “social philosophy”, by which he does not mean any special philosophical branch, as it sounds in terms of “natural philosophy” or “philosophy of history”. This “social” human society is not a narrowly defined circle. It is not a subject among other subjects. Social philosophy is the philosophy of education, which in this sense is itself a social condition, a social action which is an “ontological explanation of human co-existence”.²⁶

Only here, and not in the theory of education, it seems people do not want to live together only when they are in danger, peril or poverty, but even when they are the happiest. It is precisely the ability to share a joy and sorrow, love or hate, friendship and hostility, war or peace, openness and receptivity to contradictory indifference that Fink sees as the basis of a multi-layered co-existence. Co-existence is openness to co-humanity. Man exists and co-exists in such a way that he must always reflect on his own existence and the existence of everything that is present and behave in a certain way towards his self-reflection. At the same time, this is the essential vocation of a “good” education.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

²⁶ FINK, Eugen. *Traktat...*, pp. 17–18.

SEZNAM LITERATURY

DĚDEČKOVÁ, Eva. *Kozmologická filozofia výchovy Eugena Finka*. Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Education, 2018. ISBN 978-80-7603-011-4.

FINK, Eugen. Die Fragwürdigkeit des modernen Erziehers. *Die deutsche Schule* 51/1959, pp. 149–162.

FINK, Eugen, SCHWARZ, Franz-Anton (eds.). *Existenz und Coexistenz: Grundprobleme der menschlichen Gemeinschaft*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1987. ISBN 3-88479-305-5.

FINK, Eugen. *Erziehungswissenschaft und Lebenslehre*. Freiburg: Rombach, 1978.

FINK, Eugen, SCHWARZ, Franz-Anton (eds.). *Natur, Freiheit, Welt: Philosophie der Erziehung*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1992. ISBN 3-88479-674-7.

FINK, Eugen. *Traktat über die Gewalt des Menschen*. Frankfurt a. Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1974.

HODGKINSON, Tom. *Líný rodič: lenošením a nečinností k lepšímu rodičovství: zaručený návod, jak být pohodovým rodičem*. Brno: Jota, 2009. ISBN 978-80-7217-665-6.

KOUKOLÍK, František, DRTILOVÁ, Jana. *Vzpoura deprivantů: o špatných lidech, skupinové hlouposti a uchvácené moci*. Praha: Makropulos, 1996. ISBN 80-901776-8-9.

TEILHARD DE CHARDIN, Pierre. *Místo člověka v přírodě: Výbor studií*. Praha: Svoboda, 1967.

(*Doc. PhDr. Naděžda Pelcová, CSc.*, je vedoucí Katedry občanské výchovy a filosofie UK PedF, specializuje se na filosofickou antropologii a filosofii výchovy.)